DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 658 HE 001 171

AUTHOR	Russell, John Dale
TITLE	Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Virginia.
INSTITUTION	Virginia Higher Education Study Commission, Richmond.
Report No	Staff Rep-11
Pub Date	65
Note	94p.
EDRS Price	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.80
Descriptors	Agency Role, *Educational Coordination, *Financial Support, *Governing Boards, *Higher Education, Policy Formation, Power Structure, *State Universities
Identifiers	*Virginia

Abstract

This analysis of the control and coordination of higher education programs involves those colleges and universities in Virginia that operate under direct state control. Chapter I explains why the report deals only with external controls rather than with the internal organization and structure of the institutions discussed. Chapter II presents state provisions for and discusses the appointments, terms, characteristics and responsibilities of the Boards of Visitors that govern the thirteen 4-year and eleven 2-year state-controlled institutions of higher education. The members of these boards must be appointed through state governmental agencies to qualify the institutions for the designation "state-controlled." Chapter III deals with the level of institutional support, the need for professional budget analyses, practices concerning the use of locally derived revenue, the improvement of faculty salaries, tuition fees, scholarships, endowments, student housing, and policies governing the solicitation of private funds. Chapter IV describes those state agencies with responsibilities that affect higher education, and Chapter V discusses the responsibilities of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia and its role in the coordination of the state's higher education programs. (WM)

ED033658

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

*Lloyd C. Bird, *Chairman*
*Sol W. Rawls, Jr., *Vice-Chairman*
*R. William Arthur
*Joseph E. Blackburn
Robert P. Daniel
Howard C. Gilmer, Jr.
Herbert H. Goodman
Daniel C. Lewis
John A. Logan, Jr.
Appointed (8-11-65) to replace Spencer
*William H. McFarlane
R. Cosby Moore
*James W. Mullen, II
Sam E. Pope
John D. Richmond
Edward P. Simpkins, Jr.
Samuel R. Spencer, Jr.
Resigned (8-11-65) Teaching in Europe
*T. Edward Temple
*William H. Trapnell
J. Hoge Tyler, III
Woodrow W. Wilkerson
Doris B. Yingling

* *Executive Committee*

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

HIGHER EDUCATION *Study* COMMISSION

Dr. John Dale Russell
Director

Dr. James R. Connor
Associate Director

R. Jan LeCroy
Research Associate

State Council of Higher Education
Secretariat to the Commission

Rooms 1000-1005 Tenth Floor
Life Insurance Company of Virginia Building
914 Capitol Street, Richmond, 23219

Staff Report #11

CONTROL AND COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

By

John Dale Russell
Director of the Study

HE001171

THIS STAFF REPORT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY THE HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY COMMISSION. THE RELEASE OF THIS REPORT DOES NOT IMPLY AN ENDORSEMENT BY THE COMMISSION OF ANY SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS HEREIN CONTAINED.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOREWORD

The Virginia General Assembly in 1964, under Senate Joint Resolution No. 30, authorized the Governor to appoint a Commission on Higher Education, and directed the Commission "...to undertake a comprehensive study and review of higher education, to be used as a basis for effective long-range planning as to objectives, needs, and resources of public and private higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia." The members appointed to the Commission are listed on the title page of this volume. The Commission selected a staff for carrying on the Study and approved an outline of the topics to be covered. Several of these topics required the collection and interpretation of extensive data; the detailed analyses of problems led, in many cases, to suggestions for their solution. The results of these detailed studies, prepared by staff members and consultants, are published as Staff Reports, to make the information generally available.

Staff Report #11, published herewith, is concerned with the control and coordination of higher education in Virginia. Attention is first given to the provisions the State has made for the governing boards of the institutions that are under state control. Certain elements of the financing of the institutions that affect controls are also discussed. The various

agencies at the level of state government which have some dealings with the institutions of higher education are described briefly. The final chapter of the Report deals with the coordination of the State's programs of higher education, as exercised through the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

The information on which Staff Report #11 is based has been gathered from the existing statutory provisions and from conferences with staff members of a number of state agencies and with institutional officials. Dr. James R. Connor, Associate Director of the Higher Education Study Commission compiled the data on the institutional Boards of Visitors, and certain of the other materials used in this Staff Report. The writing of the Report has been done by the Director of the Study.

The text of Staff Report #11 represents only the findings and interpretations of the author. The Report has been reviewed by the Higher Education Study Commission but the release of the Report does not imply an endorsement by the Commission of any suggestions and recommendations herein contained.

John Dale Russell
Director of the Study

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword (by the Director of the Study)		ii
List of Tables		v
CHAPTER I.	SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	1
II.	INSTITUTIONAL BOARDS	6
III.	FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA	30
IV.	STATE AGENCIES HAVING SOME RESPONSIBILITIES TOUCHING HIGHER EDUCATION	53
V.	THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Composition of Boards of Virginia's State-controlled Institutions of Higher Education	18
2.	Appointments and Terms of Members of Boards of Virginia's State-controlled Institutions of Higher Education	26

CHAPTER I

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This present Study of higher education in Virginia is limited, insofar as the analysis of the control and coordination of the programs of higher education is concerned, to the institutions operated under state control. The privately controlled colleges and universities are outside the scope of this analysis. All the publicly controlled institutions in Virginia are under direct state control, for the State has no municipal university and no local or district community or junior colleges, such as are common in many other states. In Staff Report #11 the term "institution" or "college" or "university" will be understood to mean those in Virginia that are state-controlled, unless otherwise specifically indicated. This will save the use of the long hyphenated modifier, state-controlled, when reference is made to the institutions under analysis.

The analysis in Staff Report #11 is limited to what may be designated as the external controls of the institutions of higher education. It was agreed by the Higher Education Study Commission, when the outline of the Study was first developed, that there would be no investigation of the internal administrative organization and structure of the various institutions. This decision was influenced by three considerations. In the first

place such an analysis would have required more time than has been available for completion in the present Study.

In the second place the internal administrative pattern of a college or university is normally a matter for determination by the authorities of the institution itself, rather than a general or continuing concern of state authorities or agencies such as the General Assembly and the various executive offices of the State. The present Study is directed principally to matters of state-wide interest, and largely to those that might conceivably be of concern to members of the General Assembly and the executive officers of the State.

In the third place there seemed to be no reason to believe that there is anything very radically wrong at present with the internal arrangements of the institutions for their own operations and control. It is conceivable that at some time in the future, if there are charges of mismanagement or of inefficient operation, the State would need to make inquiry about the pattern of internal administrative organization in its institutions, but this does not seem to be the case at present. For these reasons the treatment in Staff Report #11 begins with some analysis of the boards that are in charge of the institutions, and proceeds to the agencies at the state level that exercise functions of control and coordination over the institutional programs.

In any institution of higher education the method of its financing

becomes an important consideration in the analysis of the controls under which it operates. The present Study did not have the data to make an intensive analysis of the finances of the Virginia institutions, but a few of the major features of the plan for their support can be considered in connection with the discussion of institutional controls. This discussion will be found in Chapter III of Staff Report #11, following the presentation of the material concerning the institutional boards.

To a typical academician "control" is a bad word, especially as applied to educational operations. Control tends quickly to be weighted with a negative connotation and to imply restriction.

Resistance to controls is not limited to academic institutions, for it is known to some degree in every sort of human organization. The term "control" as used in this Staff Report is not intended to refer solely to restrictions on institutional operations. Controls can be in a positive direction and can facilitate as well as restrict. Controls can be agencies for the promotion and development in sound directions, as well as for the avoidance of schemes that might dissipate resources or use them unwisely.

It is often argued that, inasmuch as a college or university consists essentially of a company of scholars gathered for cooperation in an educational enterprise, the faculty body should be the basic agency for

the control of the institution. In fact, a realistic view of the operations of colleges and universities would lead to the conclusion that their programs actually consist of what the scholars on the faculties do, regardless of other kinds of control. These faculty activities may in many cases have no great similarity to the announced statement of aims and purposes or to the pronouncements in the charter or the statute authorizing the establishment of the institution. In the legal view of the situation, however, the institution operates under the authority that is conferred upon a board. The board may wisely delegate much actual authority to the faculty, but the basic responsibility still belongs to the board. The board and its executive officers can be held legally responsible for whatever may happen in the college; the faculty cannot be so held.

Inasmuch as this Report does not go into the general administrative pattern of the Virginia institutions of higher education, consideration begins with the boards of control. The omission of the reference to faculty control in no sense deprecates the place of the faculty in the institutional administration. The limitation in this Report to external controls certainly is not intended to suggest that the administrative staff of the institution, particularly its chief executive officer, is of minor importance in institutional control and direction.

CHAPTER II

INSTITUTIONAL BOARDS

The pattern of institutional control through boards whose members are not employees is almost universal in the United States, but is not widely followed elsewhere in the world. In other countries universities operated under governmental auspices are typically controlled through a governmental bureaucracy, such as the Ministry of Education. Other kinds of universities elsewhere in the world may have final control lodged in their faculties or even in their students. Historians have pointed out that the pattern of control through a board did not originate in the United States but probably in Scotland and the Netherlands. It is in the United States, however, that one finds by far the largest number of examples of institutions of higher education with final control lodged in boards.

The principal exception in the United States to the pattern of institutional control through a lay board is represented by the institutions affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church, which are generally under the direct control of the hierarchy of the Church or its teaching Orders. In many cases the Catholic institutions have advisory boards which exercise some of the sorts of control that are customary in the boards of other types of American colleges and universities.

A variety of titles is used for the designation of boards of control of institutions of higher education in the United States. The most common is board of trustees, which is found in both the privately controlled and in the publicly controlled colleges and universities. Other titles frequently used are board of regents, board of governors, or board of control. There is no common pattern of differences in function or nature of control associated with difference in the titles of institutional boards in the United States. Virginia has been unique in using a title "Board of Visitors" as a designation for the boards that have been set up for the control of each of its state institutions of higher education. Mr. Randolph M. Church, State Librarian, in February 1965 gave this statement of the origin and meaning of the term Board of Visitors in a letter to a staff member of the Governor's Office:

> In connection with your letter of February 17, as you surmise the term "Board of Visitors," for the governing bodies of educational institutions, is of English origin and its usage in printed sources has been found as early as the sixteenth century. "Board of Trustees" appears to be of later origin and has more legalistic connotations in that it presupposes a trust, usually monetary in character. The first charter of William and Mary College established a "Board of Trustees" for government but with no method of replacing them. When this Board, by attrition, was materially reduced, a new charter established a "Board of Visitors" which was self perpetuating. When Jefferson became interested in the establishment of a university, he was appointed a member of the "Board of Trustees" of Albemarle Academy. When this became Central College and later the University of Virginia, its governing board was designated "Board of Visitors."

"Board of Regents," used as a governing body of educational

> institutions, is largely a United States term. While the word "regent" was used in England in the sense of a university official, boards do not seem to have been so designated.

Although the designation "Board of Visitors" as used in Virginia might seem to imply that the Board has little authority in the affairs of its institution, in actual practice in Virginia these boards exercise all the powers and carry all responsibilities usually lodged in boards controlling institutions of higher education in other states, by whatever name such boards may be known.

Each member of the Boards of Visitors of the Virginia institutions is either appointed by the Governor of the Commonwealth or is an ex officio member by virtue of holding some other office in the State government. Appointive members are subject to confirmation by the Senate or the General Assembly. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is ex officio a member of each of the Boards of Visitors. In addition, the Adjutant General is ex officio a member of the Board of Virginia Military Institute. Similarly, the President of the Board of Agriculture and Immigration is ex officio a member of the Board of Visitors of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The appointment of Board members in Virginia is similar to the pattern followed in many other states. In some states, however, members of the boards controlling state universities and colleges are elected by popular vote. In general, the plan of appointment by the Governor, with confirmation

by one or both houses of the Legislature, is considered the desirable practice. It is commendable that Virginia follows this practice.

The fact that the Virginia institutions are controlled by boards whose members receive their appointments through state governmental agencies qualifies these institutions for the designation "state-controlled." This makes for a clear-cut categorization of institutions between those which are state-controlled and those which are privately controlled, inasmuch as the latter are institutions having boards whose members are not appointed through governmental agencies. Sometimes the attempt is made to designate the two types of institutions as state-supported and privately supported, but this is not a sound basis of classification. The privately controlled institutions get support from public sources through the tax exemption privilege and their qualification for grants from the Federal government, and thus they too are publicly supported to some extent. The state-controlled institutions get support from many private sources such as student fees, gifts and grants, and alumni funds, so they too could be classified as privately supported. The only sound distinction between classes of institutions is on the basis of the nature of their controlling board; here there is a sharp separation between those that are state-controlled and those that are privately controlled.

The state-controlled institutions in Virginia sometimes refer to themselves as "state-aided institutions" rather than as state-controlled.

This may be because of some fundamental objection to the word "control" itself, or perhaps the use of the term is intended to convey to the public the idea of a rather limited participation by the State in the financial support of the institutions. While it is true that support from state sources in Virginia is rather limited, this does not mean that the institutions are no longer the children of the State. If a youngster in the family has to sell newspapers or shine shoes or baby-sit or beg on the streets to get the funds needed for what is considered a proper way of life, this does not mean that he or she is no longer a child of the family or removed from parental control.

The 13 four-year institutions and the 11 two-year colleges are under the control of 11 different Boards of Visitors in Virginia. Each of the four-year colleges has its own Board of Visitors with two exceptions: Mary Washington College is operated under the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia; Virginia State College at Norfolk is operated under the Board of Visitors of Virginia State College at Petersburg. The 11 two-year colleges are all branches of one of three parent four-year institutions, and are operated under the respective Boards of Visitors of the parent institutions.

The present pattern of Boards of Visitors represents some important changes that have been made in recent years. Formerly the institutions that served as state teachers colleges were all under the control of the

State Board of Education; this was changed recently so that each of these institutions now has its own separate Board of Visitors. This was a commendable move and is in line with progress being made in several other states.

At one time Radford College was operated under the Board of Visitors of Virginia Polytechnic Institute as a branch college, but later a separate Board of Visitors was set up for Radford College and the relationship with Virginia Polytechnic Institute was severed. Radford College seems to have flourished under its own Board of Visitors.

The institutions now known as Old Dominion College and Richmond Professional Institute had origins in extension programs of The College of William and Mary. These programs grew in strength and in volume of enrollment to the point where four-year degree-granting curriculums were established. Separate institutions were then created, each with its own Board of Visitors, and the relationship with The College of William and Mary was severed. In the case of Richmond Professional Institute, there was a merger with a privately controlled institution whose name was preserved in the new state-controlled institution in Richmond.

Some of the two-year branch colleges have openly declared ambitions to become four-year colleges, and at least two of them seem to be attaining

the volume of service and the strength in their facilities that will warrant this step. It may confidently be expected that, when this development occurs, these colleges will follow the precedent already set, and that in due time they will become independent institutions, each with its own Board of Visitors.

At present there are two anomalies in the Virginia situation, in that two institutions, which have considerable strength and maintain four-year degree-granting programs, are still operated as branches under the Board of Visitors of their respective parent institutions. One of these situations, which has already been mentioned, is Virginia State College at Norfolk, which is under the Board of Visitors of Virginia State College at Petersburg. The chief executive officer at Virginia State College at Norfolk is given the title Provost; he reports directly to the President of Virginia State College at Petersburg. It is planned that in due time the situation will be changed, so that the Norfolk branch will become a full-fledged degree-granting state college in its own right. But the Norfolk branch must first achieve strength so that it will be certain of meeting standards for accreditation as a separate institution, without relying on the strength of its parent college. It is generally agreed that in the near future the Norfolk branch will be given its own separate identity and a distinctive name, and that a separate Board of Visitors will be established for it.

The corresponding situation, also previously mentioned, is Mary Washington College at Fredericksburg, which is operated as a branch of the University of Virginia and is under the general control of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia. In other respects Mary Washington College operates with a high degree of automony, especially in its academic program. Rather curiously the Chancellor of Mary Washington College is a member of the informal organization known as The Council of State College Presidents; the Provost of Norfolk branch of Virginia State College is not a member of that group.

The pattern that has generally been followed in Virginia, in giving each degree-granting institution its own identity and its own Board of Visitors, is entirely sound. Experience in other states clearly leads to the conclusion that a degree-granting institution can seldom attain distinction if it is operated as a branch of another college or university, even if the mother institution be a very strong one. The parental care of a strong, well established college or university may be advantageous in the initial development of a new college, but to continue this subordinate relationship too long almost inevitably slows the development of the dependent college, and usually limits the pattern of service which it provides. To change the figure that has been used previously, absentee landlordism does not seem conducive to the development of the branch as an outstanding institution

of higher education. Leaders in Virginia should be commended for having maintained the general policy of providing each degree-granting institution with a separate Board of Visitors. This policy should be continued as new centers for four-year degree-granting curriculums of higher education are developed in the State.

The situation in Mary Washington College is actually the only contravention of the general policy of a separate Board of Visitors for each four-year degree-granting institution in Virginia. In the long range plans of the State, consideration should be given to bringing this institution in line with the general policy, but there is no urgency about such a change. At present the arrangement is working smoothly, largely because of the fine spirit of cooperation exhibited by the chief executive officers of the two institutions and the excellent personal relationships that prevail between them.

Mary Washington College enjoys relatively few advantages from its relationship with the University of Virginia, and there are some disadvantages. Data presented in Staff Report #3 show clearly that Mary Washington College does not serve well its immediate area of the State. Students at Mary Washington College are treated the same as those from any other college in the country on application for transfer to the University at Charlottesville. The benefits of the relatively large endowment funds of the University are not available for the support of the program at Mary Washington College. The College

has no privilege of naming its alumnae for positions on the University's Board of Visitors. There is suspicion in some quarters that the main interest of the University in maintaining Mary Washington College as a branch with enrollment limited to women students is to prevent pressure for a coeducational program in undergraduate arts and sciences at Charlottesville.

Nevertheless, it must be concluded that in spite of the disadvantages to the development of Mary Washington College and its service to the area of the State in which it is located, the establishment of the College on its own basis with its own Board of Visitors is not a matter of urgent importance. If either the College or the University were headed by a chief executive officer with less agreeable personality and with less willingness to cooperate, the situation would probably deteriorate rapidly and a change might be forced rather quickly.

As previously noted the 11 state-controlled two-year colleges in Virginia are operated under the Boards of Visitors of three different parent institutions. The University of Virginia has five of these branches. Virginia Polytechnic Institute has four, and The College of William and Mary two. In practice, the local chief executive officer of each two-year college reports to some specially designated official at the parent institution and through that official to the President and to the Board of Visitors. Each of the two-year colleges operated by the University of

Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute has it own local advisory committee, but The College of William and Mary does not encourage the creation of local advisory committees for its branches. In Staff Report #4, which deals extensively with the two-year college programs in Virginia, the recommendation is made that the state-controlled two-year colleges be taken from under the management of the parent four-year institutions and set up as comprehensive community colleges, under the control of a state board similar to the present State Board of Technical Education.

Although the title of the controlling board for each of the Virginia institutions is "Board of Visitors" in common usage, the actual legal titles vary somewhat. In Longwood College the legal title is "The Visitors of Longwood College" and this style is followed in the legal names of the boards for Madison College, Radford College, and Virginia State College. The same pattern is followed in Old Dominion College, except that the legal title there is "The Visitors of Norfolk College;" this was the original name of the institution, but the Board of Visitors was specifically authorized to choose a distinctive and appropriate name for it. A unique title is legally authorized for the Board of the University of Virginia: "The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia." The third pattern of board titles is found at The College of William and Mary, where the Board of

Visitors is "Under the Style of The College of William and Mary." A similar formula is used for the Boards of the Medical College of Virginia, Richmond Professional Institute, Virginia Military Institute, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. These variations in legal titles are of no special significance, except as they might at some time and in some jurisdictions complicate the receipt of a bequest if the precise legal name is not used by the testator.

Table 1 shows the number of members on each of the institutional Boards of Visitors and facts about the methods of their selection and appointment.

Four of the Virginia Boards of Visitors have 12 members, one has 13 members, two have 14, three have 15, and one has 17. In general, the Boards are larger than in most other state-controlled colleges and universities throughout the country, though the largest Virginia Board of Visitors is far below the upper range in number of members on boards of state-controlled institutions in this country. In theory, a board with 5 to 9 members is considered of ideal size, with 11 about the maximum for effective action as a group. Beyond such limits the group is likely to be too large to give each member opportunity for expression on an issue, and the tendency in the larger boards is to develop a series of small committees which practically take over separate functions of the board. A large board nearly always

Table 1. COMPOSITION OF BOARDS OF VIRGINIA'S STATE-CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Institutions	Number of Members on Board			Required Alumni Members		Nominations for Appointments Made by Alumni?	Is Governor Restricted to the Nominees of Alumni?
	Appointed	Ex Officio	Total	Number	Per Cent of Appointees		
The College of William and Mary	14	1	15	-	-	Yes	No
Longwood College	11	1	12	-	-	Yes	No
Madison College	11	1	12	-	-	Yes	No
Medical College of Virginia	12	1	13	-	-	Yes	No
Old Dominion College	13	1	14	-	-	Yes	No
Radford College	11	1	12	-	-	Yes	No
Richmond Professional Institute	13	1	14	-	-	Yes	No
University of Virginia	16	1	17	11	68.7	Yes	No
Virginia Military Institute	13	2	15	10	76.9	Yes	No
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	13	2	15	6	46.2	Yes	No
Virginia State College at Petersburg	11	1	12	-	-	No	-

has to have an executive committee to which large powers for immediate action are delegated.

Although the observation is made that the Boards of the Virginia institutions have more members than is usually considered desirable, this does not indicate need for any action at present to change the situation, except as a request might arise from one or more of the institutions. To reduce the number of members on an existing institutional board is usually a difficult process. It is always easier to increase the number rather than to decrease the number of board members for a college or university. The point of size is raised here rather as a guide to future policy. It is suggested that, when new Boards of Visitors are established for institutions not now having them, consideration be given to a limitation on the number of board members to the range of 5 to 9.

Like many other states Virginia has followed the practice of making the State Superintendent of Public Instruction an ex officio member of each institutional Board of Visitors. As previously noted, two institutions each have in addition one other ex officio member on the Board of Visitors. A theory behind the designation of ex officio members on institutional boards is that some person or persons, by virtue of some other office held, should be represented in the highest councils of an institution of higher education.

In the past it has seemed appropriate in many states for the State

Superintendent of Public Instruction to be named as an ex officio member on all boards of state-controlled colleges and universities. The theory was that the officer in general charge of the public school system of the State could render some service in maintaining close articulation between the public elementary and secondary schools and the colleges and universities. It has also been thought that, if one person regularly sits with every institutional board at each of its meetings, there will be a kind of communication between the boards and an influence that will coordinate their decisions, instead of allowing each board to act in ignorance of what other boards are doing or planning.

Today these arguments are of doubtful validity. State after state has, like Virginia, had to set up other means for coordinating the programs of its institutions of higher education. Articulation with elementary and secondary schools with college and university programs is accomplished, not so much by decisions at the level of top management represented by the Board of Visitors, as by close contact between the instructional and supervisory personnel who are immediately concerned with the teaching and welfare of students.

There is admittedly an advantage in having a person like the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on each institutional board, for such officials generally are of high caliber and they are in most instances able to approach problems from a point of view of the professional educator

rather than that of the layman. It is argued, however, that the board should get its professional information and advice from the officials of the institution rather than from some one member of the board, for the board is supposed especially to represent the layman's point of view in educational matters.

There is one practical difficulty in naming the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on the board of each of the state-controlled institutions of higher education. In a state where there are many such boards (Virginia at present has 11), the State Superintendent has difficulty finding time to attend all the necessary meetings. If each of the 11 Boards in Virginia meets monthly for at least one day or sometimes two days, as is true of comparable boards in other States, the State Superintendent would have to spend half his working days attending meetings of Boards of Visitors. To this might be added some additional time if he also serves, as any board member should, on one or more committees of each Board. The State Superintendent has a full-time job in his responsibilities for the public school system and it seems hardly fair to ask him to spend half time or more in activities connected with membership on college and university boards.

In Virginia, as in other states, where the State Superintendent of Public Instruction has conscience about his obligations as a board member, he often has to send a subordinate staff member of the State Department of Education to represent him at board meetings. A different staff

member may represent the State Superintendent on different occasions at Board meetings. It is usually difficult for the substitute to perform the functions of a voting member of the Board. If additional Boards of Visitors are established in Virginia for institutions that may be created in the future, as seems probable, the situation will be still further complicated.

No suggestion is made for any change at present in the legal provisions for ex officio memberships on the institutional Boards of Visitors in Virginia. It may be wise, however, as new Boards of Visitors are established for newly recognized institutions, to drop the provisions for ex officio members.

The provisions for the selection of appointive members of the various Boards of Visitors uniformly lodge the appointing power in the hands of the Governor of Virginia. This is as it should be. Confirmation of the appointments by the General Assembly is legally required for six institutions; Longwood College, Madison College, Old Dominion College, Radford College, Richmond Professional Institute, and Virginia State College. The Governor's appointments are subject to confirmation, according to the statutes, by the Senate in the case of three institutions: the Medical College of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. No mention of confirmation by the General Assembly or the Senate is made in the provisions for the appointment of members

for the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia or The College of William and Mary, though for the latter institution confirmation by the General Assembly was required until 1962 when there was a change in the statute. In practice, the appointment of board members for both the University of Virginia and The College of William and Mary are submitted for confirmation by the Senate. In general the provisions and practice for the appointment of board members of the Virginia institutions are standard and entirely satisfactory.

As in many states, the alumni (alumnae) of most of the Virginia institutions participate rather actively in the selection of members for their respective Boards of Visitors. In all the institutions except one the statutes provide that the alumni may submit to the Governor a list of three names for each new appointment that is being made. The conspicuous exception to this general statutory provision is in the case of the Board of Visitors of Virginia State College. In every institution, however, the Governor is free to make appointments of persons not on the recommended list of nominees submitted by the alumni.

In the case of three of the Virginia institutions the Governor's choice of new board members is restricted by statute, so that a certain number of the appointments must be from the institution's alumni. At the University of Virginia 11 of the 16 appointed members of the Board of Visitors (68. 7 per cent) must be alumni of the University.

At Virginia Military Institute 10 of the 13 appointed members (76. 9 per cent) must be alumni. And at Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6 of the 13 appointed board members (46. 2 per cent) must be alumni. Similar restrictions are not imposed on the Governor's choice of board members for any of the other Virginia institutions.

The proportion of alumni memberships that are required on the boards of the three institutions mentioned above seem excessive--slightly less than half in the case of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, more than two-thirds in the case of the University of Virginia, and more than three-fourths in the case of Virginia Military Institute. Not infrequently it will also happen that the ex officio member or members of the board may also be alumni, further increasing the preponderance of alumni influence at the topmost level of institutional control. It is true that most alumni have a great interest and deep affection for their alma mater, though this condition is often expressed more with respect to athletic sports than with the academic program. The criticism of excessive alumni control is that it often tends to be ultraconservative. Too many alumni want their institution kept as it was when they were students, opposing change to meet new conditions and new demands.

In the normal course of events, the Governor can be expected to find a great many outstanding citizens of the State who are alumni of an institution and suitable for appointment to its Board of Visitors, and

the provisions for nominations for new appointments by alumni groups further should keep the Governor well informed about the presence in the alumni group of people who would be suitable for board membership. These channels of alumni influence should be sufficient, without the legal requirement that the Governor must appoint to the board of a specific institution a large number of persons who are its alumni. It is commendable that this provision has been dropped in the more recently enacted statutes setting up Boards of Visitors, and this policy should be continued in future enactments.

The Virginia statutes are uniform in providing that each board member is appointed for a four-year term. The provision is also uniform for all institutions that a board member cannot be reappointed immediately after he has served two four-year terms. The length of terms for board appointments is entirely satisfactory and the provisions for limiting board members to two successive terms is also wise. Table 2 presents information showing the frequency with which appointments are made, and a calculation of the maximum number and percentage of appointive members of each board that might possible be new to service on the board at any one time.

With the exception of two institutions, the appointments for board membership are effective every two years and approximately half the appointed members might be new to service on a Board of Visitors at

Table 2. APPOINTMENTS AND TERMS OF MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF VIRGINIA'S STATE-CONTROLLED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Institution	Frequency of Appointment of Board Members	Appointive Members Possibly New at One Time	
		Number	Per Cent
The College of William and Mary	7 every two years	7	50.0
Longwood College	Every two years, 6 and 5	6	55.5
Madison College	Every two years, 6 and 5	6	55.5
Medical College of Virginia	3 each year	3	25.0
Old Dominion College	Every two years, 7 and 6	7	53.8
Radford College	Every two years, 6 and 5	6	55.5
Richmond Professional Institute	Every two years, 7 and 6	7	53.8
University of Virginia	6 in one year 3 in next year 7 in third year	7	43.8
Virginia Military Institute	6 every two years	6	46.2
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	4 in one year 2 in next year 4 in third year 3 in fourth year	4	30.8
Virginia State College at Petersburg	Every two years, 6 and 5	6	55.5

the beginning of each two-year period. The exceptions to this general rule are Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the Medical College of Virginia. At Virginia Polytechnic Institute four new board appointees come to the Board of Visitors in one year, two the next, four the third year, and three the fourth. Thus at one time not more than 30.8 per cent of the appointed members on the Board of Visitors would be without at least one year's experience in service on the board. At the Medical College of Virginia one-fourth of the appointed members of the Board have terms expiring each year, so that not more than 25 per cent of the Board members would normally be new to service on the Board at any one time.

Because of the heavy responsibilities the Boards of Visitors carry for the general direction and policy control of the institutions, it is important to have a considerable element of stability in the membership of each board. Studies in other states have shown that at least one-third of the board membership should always have at least one year of experience in service on the board, and appointments should be staggered in such a way as to make such provision.

It would be simple in the case of the Virginia Boards to make a change to accomplish the purpose of spreading the beginning dates of board memberships so that at any one time not more than a third of the board members would be new to service on the Board. If the

appointments by the Governor approved by the General Assembly or Senate at each biennial session are divided, so that half begin service in the year the appointment is made and half the following year, the desired element of continuity of board membership would be provided. The changeover could be made by legislative prescription of the years for which the appointment is made. In initiating this system the proper number of the present board members could hold over for an additional year, until the appointments of their successors become effective, under the general statute providing that a board member holds office until his successor is appointed and qualified. Or it might be possible to appoint one-half of the new members to a one year term plus appointment at the same time to succeed themselves in a four-year term, to begin one year later.

It is recommended that the practice be instituted of appointing members to institutional Boards of Visitors in Virginia so that approximately one-fourth of the terms expire each year, instead of half every two years as at present. It should be noted that the Boards of the Medical College of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute already conform to this practice.

One of the great strengths of American democracy is the willingness of outstanding citizens to render public service of various kinds, often at some sacrifice of their own immediate personal interest.

Higher education in the United States has particularly benefited by the willingness of citizens to serve as members of boards controlling colleges and universities. The state-controlled institutions of Virginia are no exception to this general rule, and the roster of those who have served or are serving as members of the various Boards of Visitors is most impressive. The service takes time. It involves much careful study of reports and other documents. It entails a heavy responsibility. Board members frequently bear much criticism because of actions taken or not taken. Service on the Board of Visitors of a distinguished institution is a real honor but the rewards and emoluments of such service are intangible though often deeply satisfying to those who can see their institution serving effectively in the education of youth, in the development of new knowledge and research, and in the various forms of public service.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has been fortunate in having so many capable citizens willing to serve as members of the Boards of Visitors of its colleges and universities, men and women who unselfishly devote their time and attention to this important public duty. They deserve the appreciation and thanks of every citizen in the Commonwealth for their service.

CHAPTER III

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

A thorough analysis of the financing of the institutions of higher education in Virginia was not feasible as a part of the present Study. The chief obstacle to making a complete analysis is the lack of uniformity in the financial accounting and reporting by the various institutions. Steps were being taken at the time this Study was initiated to improve the uniformity of the financial reporting by state-controlled institutions, but the revisions could go into effect only with the fiscal year 1964-65 and the final financial reports for that year were not available in time to use in this Study.

Currently, another Commission of the General Assembly has been working on the policies of financial accounting and reporting by institutions of higher education and other state agencies, in the interest of improving the form in which budgetary requests are submitted and analyzed. There has been considerable consultation between staff members of that Commission and the staff members of the Higher Education Study Commission. It is believed that the recommendations affecting financial reporting by institutions of higher education made by this other

Commission, will be effective in producing data suitable for sound analyses of institutional income and expenditures.

Level of Financial Support

The general level of Virginia's financial support of its institutions of higher education seems to have been improving in recent years. This is commendable and it is appreciated, not only by those who are concerned with the operation of the institutions, but by all citizens who have a high regard for the ultimate welfare of the State. It must be remembered, however, that improvements are taking place rapidly in higher education throughout the entire country.

Figures have recently been compiled by Dr. M. M. Chambers of Indiana University showing for each of the 50 States trends in the appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education for each alternate fiscal year from 1959-60 through 1965-66. For the country as a whole the total appropriations of state tax funds for current operating expenses of higher education rose from approximately $1,399 million in 1959-60, to $3,034 million in 1965-66, an increase of 117 per cent, or a more than doubling in the six-year period. In this same period, the appropriations in Virginia of state tax funds for current operating expenses of its institutions of higher education increased 60 per cent. This was at less than half the rate maintained throughout the entire country in the last six years, according to the data compiled by Dr.

Chambers. In the last biennium, when 1963-64 appropriations of state tax funds for current operating expenses are compared with those of 1965-66, the increases for the total 50 States is 39 per cent. In this same two-year period, similar appropriations in Virginia increased 13. 5 per cent or at only one-third the rate for the entire country. The indication is that Virginia is not only increasing its state tax appropriations for current support of higher education at a rate less rapid than the rest of the country, but also that in the most recent two-year period Virginia has been lagging even farther behind other states than it did in the immediately preceding years.

This Study does not make any specific recommendations about the appropriations Virginia should make in the current support of its institutions of higher education or for any of the individual institutions. This is a problem for the budget makers and the budget review agencies. The only counsel that seems warranted by such limited data as have been reviewed by the Higher Education Study Commission is that the Commonwealth of Virginia is by no means lavish in its support of higher education and that careful attention should be given to the requests of the institutions for improvement in their financial support from public funds.

Budget Analysis

One difficulty that the Commonwealth of Virginia faces in its

provision of financial support of its institutions of higher education is the lack of any provisions for professional scrutiny of institutional budget requests by a competent agency at the state level. This function is performed at present by the Division of the Budget but, as previously indicated, the financial data at present available for the Virginia institutions do not permit this sort of critical analysis because of lack of uniformity in the financial accounting and reporting. Furthermore, the Division of the Budget does not have any regular staff members who would be recognized as authorities on the finance of higher education or competent to exercise professional insights in analyzing budget requests and recommending amounts to be appropriated. Competence of this sort is nearly always to be found in the staff of an agency such as the State Council of Higher Education. But in Virginia, the State Council of Higher Education rather curiously has been forbidden by statute to spend any of its supporting appropriation on the making of analyses of institutional budgets and finances. It would seem entirely normal for members of the General Assembly, in such circumstances, to doubt whether the funds recommended for appropriation are really needed. Without competent analysis, it is difficult to judge whether the various institutions are being fairly treated in their recommended appropriations.

The remedy for this situation seems clear. The State Council of Higher Education should be required to make a thorough analysis of the

budget requests of each of the institutions and should have a staff competent for this purpose. The findings from this analysis should be transmitted to the Governor for consideration when final determinations are made regarding the appropriations to each institution. The Governor and the members of the General Assembly should receive the recommendations for institutional appropriations from the State Council of Higher Education and the State Council should furnish supporting evidence in the form of fiscal analyses it has made. The recommendations and analyses of the State Council should be accompanied by the original requests and justifications as submitted by the institutions themselves, so that the Governor and the General Assembly can see what modifications have been made by the Council and can have some idea of the reasons for those modifications.

Experience in other states indicates that when the Governor and the legislature are given this sort of professional analysis and recommendation, their confidence is greatly increased in the financial needs expressed by and for the institutions of higher education. There is likely to be a feeling that proposed appropriations are distributed among the institutions as fairly as is humanly possible. The net result is that the legislative body is more generously inclined to provide adequate support of the institutions, than when its actions

are taken without convincing supporting evidence from a professional analysis of the budget request.

Appropriation of Locally Derived Revenues

Another practice in the financing of state-controlled higher education in Virginia that should be commented upon is the insistance that all locally derived income of each institution be considered as state funds and routed through the appropriation act in specific dollar amounts. This in effect ties the hands of institutional officials in making judgments as to the best use of their locally derived revenues. It is difficult to see why the State needs to exercise this degree of control over such revenues, for no one could have more conscience than institutional authorities have about the wise use of such funds for the best interests of the State's educational service. A different plan, followed in many states, merely appropriates locally derived revenues back to the institutions in broad categories rather than in dollar amounts, and allows these locally derived funds to be spent in accordance with an operating budget showing all expected income and proposed expenditures which is filed with the appropriate state officials. Budget reports can be received regularly and checked for compliance with the officially adopted operating budget. If, in the opinion of the General Assembly or the appropriate state officials, the institution has not been spending its locally derived revenues wisely, the analysis of the operations of the

past year would clearly show it and proper steps to correct the situation could be taken when the next appropriation is made.

Control of Faculty Salary Levels

A recently adopted policy of the State which affects the financing of higher education is the decision to base institutional faculty salaries on the average of faculty salaries in comparable institutions throughout the United States. Each institution in Virginia is placed in a category consisting of what are supposed to be similar institutions; for budget purposes and in actual practice the average salary of faculty members at each institution is to be the same as that for the average of the comparable institutions throughout the United States. This procedure has the great advantage of being objective. The adoption of this policy moreover constituted a "great leap forward" for Virginia, insofar as faculty salaries are concerned, and the institutions were grateful for the recognition given their needs. Once these average faculty salary levels are attained, however, as is practically the case now, some disadvantages in the policy begin to appear.

Some institutions have been dissatisfied with the category in which they are placed for national comparisons. For example, the University of Virginia does not feel that it is properly classified for salary comparisons with the state universities in the country, which vary considerably in strength. It feels rather that its faculty salaries should be compared with those of the members of the Association of American Universities consisting of

only the strongest institutions both publicly and privately controlled throughout the country; the University of Virginia is a member of this Association. Some institutions, that are moving up from a strictly undergraduate program to the offering of a master's degree, find they have to make this move on the basis of average salaries determined by the average of other colleges that are for the most part completely undergraduate institutions.

Another difficulty is that the compilations of average salaries are always a year or two out of date by the time they are available, for it usually takes more than a year to collect and compile the salary information from the institutions throughout the country. This difficulty has in part been overcome by making a projection of what the average salary for the next year will probably be on the basis of some fixed rate of increase beyond the level of salaries for the latest year available.

There is perhaps a hidden difficulty in the use of the reported average salaries throughout the country, which would be realized by anyone who has tried to collect such data and by many people who have been on the reporting end of such a project. It is a well-known fact that some of those who are responsible for reporting salary data from institutions are not as conscientious as they might be in providing accurate data. Some institutions refuse to supply salary data. The compiled averages cannot be sounder than the basic data from which they are derived.

Perhaps the greatest disadvantage of the policy of basing average salaries on the national average for institutions of the same class is the fact, discovered by most of the Virginia institutions, that their competition is not with the average situation in colleges in similar categories throughout the United States. The Virginia colleges and universities, seeking able scholars as additions to their faculties and trying to retain their most competent faculty members, must generally offer salaries that are substantially above current averages in similar institutions. The competition is not limited to institutions of the same class, for the real competition for the services of excellent faculty members comes from the strongest and best institutions of every kind throughout the country. Indeed, the competition for able personnel is not even limited to other institutions of higher education, for industry and government continually use higher salary offers to attract competent men and women from the faculties of the nation's colleges and universities.

Being tied to a national average for faculty salaries will almost inevitably mean that replacements and additions to the Virginia faculties will not be recruited from among the very most promising of the oncoming crop of young scholars. Furthermore, a large percentage of the ablest young scholars who develop at a Virginia college or university will move elsewhere as they begin to achieve distinction and recognition outside their institution.

Every college and university in the United States in these days is facing a serious problem in recruiting of new faculty members of the desired level of competence. Even some of the most prestigious institutions in the country are voicing this complaint. Virginia institutions must compete in a nationwide market for the services of those desired as additions to institutional faculties. It would be most unfortunate if Virginia cannot attract its fair share of the most promising talent when making new faculty appointments, or retain most of those who achieve distinction while in service in Virginia. The concept of meeting a nationwide average of other colleges seems to be leading in the direction of mediocrity rather than excellence for Virginia's colleges and universities.

In Staff Report #7 of the Study of Higher Education in Virginia the suggestion is made that each institution be allowed to exclude from its calculated average salary the salaries paid a limited percentage, say 2 to 5 per cent, of its faculty. These excluded salaries might be double or triple the average salary, and could be used to attract and retain a few highly competent scholars. The presence of a few such distinguished faculty members on the campus of any institution would do far more to improve the general quality of the institution than an equal amount of funds spread in raising the average salary of all faculty members. Budget requirements to support such a salary policy, moreover, would be

relatively modest. This policy is suggested as a method of freeing institutions from the straight jacket in which they are now placed by the necessity of staying within a predetermined average for all faculty salaries.

Again it must be recognized that this step in reaching the national average was, when introduced, a most important improvement for the Virginia institutions. It has been an excellent policy as far as it goes. The point of this discussion is that the time has now arrived when this policy needs to be extended somewhat, to permit the institutions in Virginia to meet the kind of competition that prevails in the national market for able personnel.

Solicitation of Funds from Private Sources

In recent years, when there has been great pressure from the institutions for increased financial support, the State of Virginia has sometimes followed the policy of providing only partial support for some desired projects or improvements, with the understanding that the institutions would have to find elsewhere the remainder of the necessary funds. For example, the improvement in faculty salaries, that came about from the policy of allowing each institution to have an average salary equivalent to the national average for its class, was based on the provision that the State would furnish half the money to make these salary improvements and each institution would have to find from other sources, such as increases in student fees or private grants, the remainder of the necessary

supporting funds. This policy, plus the unwillingness of the General Assembly to provide funds as rapidly as the pressures upon institutions seem to demand, have more or less forced the state-controlled colleges and universities to go into the business of seeking funds for support from private sources.

The privately controlled institutions of the State have developed considerable resentment at the intrusion of the state-controlled institutions into the area of fund-raising from private sources. It is disconcerting for the president of a privately controlled college to go to a person or a corporation which in the past has generally made an annual donation to his college, and be told that the funds available for such donations are being given this year to one of the state-controlled institutions, and there is nothing more for the privately controlled college. Contacts with leaders in the privately controlled institutions indicate that these complaints are not merely isolated incidents but are widespread throughout the entire privately controlled sector of higher education in Virginia. Activity in the raising of funds from private sources is more pronounced in some of the state-controlled institutions than at others but, the whole policy of asking the state-controlled institutions of higher education to depend upon this source of supporting funds is seriously questioned by leaders among the privately controlled institutions.

It would seem that the best remedy for the situation that is

complained against would be the encouragement of the State authorities and the General Assembly to provide adequate supporting funds for the state-controlled institutions. Certainly the practice of making matching appropriations, which require the institutions to get funds from other sources, should be discontinued. It is recommended that this means of providing additional financial support to state-controlled institutions be not followed as a policy by the General Assembly in the future. Such a step would remove much of the pressure now on the state-controlled institutions for the solicitation of gifts from private sources.

It is difficult to suggest any other steps for the positive prevention of what is considered an intrusion of the state-controlled institutions into the area of raising funds from private sources. For example, it does not seem feasible to pass a law forbidding officials of state-controlled institutions to seek outside funds or forbidding philanthropically inclined citizens of the State from making gifts to the state-controlled colleges and universities.

Most of the better publicly controlled colleges and universities in the United States now receive large amounts for both current support and capital outlay purposes from private sources, and Virginia institutions should not be denied the opportunity to solicit and receive such funds from sources that seem peculiarly interested in the support of such institutions. For example, probably no one would want to deny the state-controlled

institutions the opportunity of soliciting annual gifts from their own alumni. As another example, it is readily understood that a citizen of Norfolk, watching the rapid growth of Old Dominion College and the burgeoning services it is providing in the local area, might decide to contribute his charitable donation to that institution rather than to some college in another area of the State which perhaps he has formerly supported but which does not seem to be rendering much service of immediate value to the Norfolk community.

The criticism of the efforts by state-controlled institutions to secure private gifts is to some extent based on a false premise. This premise assumes that there is some fixed amount of money available for gifts to private institutions, and when one institution gets support from this pot of money the amount other institutions can get is thereby diminished. There is no evidence of the truth of this premise, for most certainly there is no fixed or predetermined amount of a total that can be raised for purposes such as higher education. In fact, experience over the years has been that the amount of charitable contributions has been steadily increasing concomitant with increases in the number of institutions and agencies soliciting such funds and the intensiveness of their efforts at solicitation. The increases in the total of such charitable gifts has been to a considerable extent the result of diligent efforts of institutional officials to cultivate sources of contributions. The general

idea that it is good to make contributions to colleges and universities can be encouraged by the record of gifts to any kind of an institution and as that general idea expands all institutions that seek funds from private sources have opportunity to benefit.

The Virginia economy is certainly capable of providing much more of this sort of support for higher education than it has ever done in the past. Those who work at encouraging such a trend are benefiting not only their own institution but all other colleges that depend on private sources for financial support. In the present situation in Virginia, it seems sufficient to call the attention of the state-controlled institutions to the severe criticism of their fund-raising activities voiced by the privately controlled colleges and universities. Members of Boards of Visitors, who are appointed by the Governor to represent the public interest, should be particularly diligent to see that their institutional officials do not exceed the bounds of whatever may be considered proper in seeking to raise supporting funds from private sources.

Endowments

The University of Virginia is among the more heavily endowed of the state universities in the United States. Quite properly the State of Virginia has adopted the policy of not assuming any controls over the expenditures of the University's endowment earnings. The University is thus in the fortunate position of being able to supplement its

appropriations of state tax funds by its endowment income. As would be expected, this has attracted some leaders in other state-controlled institutions in Virginia to look with favor upon similar development of endowment support at their own institutions. It would seem to be a mistake to make the development of a large endowment fund a primary objective for any of the other state-controlled institutions in Virginia.

The University of Virginia has received a large part of its endowment funds from sources outside the State. Some of the other colleges and universities might have a similar opportunity to raise endowment funds, but the time and energy of institutional leaders could be more profitably devoted to the cultivation of the idea that the State should support adequately its institutions of higher education without requiring them to solicit support other than that from appropriations and the usual sources of institutional revenue.

Tuition Fees and Scholarship Funds

Like most comparable institutions in other states, the Virginia state-controlled institutions of higher education have been practically forced to raise tuition fees sharply in recent years in order to get sufficient funds to meet the increasing costs of operation. A great many leaders in publicly controlled higher education throughout the United States feel that the trend toward higher tuition fees is wrong and should be reversed. At the moment, however, there seems no means of getting the necessary operating

funds without the resort to higher tuition fees. Happily at some time in the future it should be possible for the publicly controlled institutions of higher education in the United States to return to the earlier policy of charging very low fees or no fees at all to residents in the state. In some states the publicly controlled community or junior colleges are now tuition free. The General Assembly of Virginia should encourage the state-controlled colleges to keep fees low by making adequate appropriations for support from public funds.

The rising costs to students of college attendance have brought increasing demands for financial assistance to students. The Federal government has increasingly supplied funds for this purpose. The relatively large student loan funds from the Federal government under the National Defense Education Act are available for use in the Virginia institutions, and a recent act of the Congress has added provisions for Federal scholarship grants. There are also very large and generous Federal appropriations for fellowships for graduate students in certain cases. In general these and other provisions for student financial aid, while good, are not adequate to remove completely the financial barrier that keeps many able young people from college attendance.

There is some pressure for the State of Virginia to create new scholarship funds for aiding students. This device is used to a limited extent at present in Virginia in certain fields, such as teacher education,

in order to entice students to prepare for a kind of service that is at present inadequately supplied with competent personnel. The privately controlled institutions have suggested that these scholarship provisions might be extended to students attending such institutions. The present legal opinion is that this would be unconstitutional in Virginia, so the teacher education scholarships are limited to students attending state-controlled institutions.

Except as a device for recruiting students for kinds of service where competent workers are in short supply, state scholarships are not recommended as a means for overcoming the barrier created for college attendance by high tuition fees. The General Assembly would be better advised to use the available funds for the direct support of the institutions so that tuition fees can be kept low, rather than for the support of a few students by means of scholarships. Inasmuch as both the students attending college and the graduates who complete their preparation can freely cross state lines it would seem that financial assistance to students should be peculiarly a Federal responsibility rather than one for each state to assume.

When a state provides scholarship assistance it nearly always limits the recipients' choice of attendance to institutions within the State. In many cases this may not be a wise limitation for the individual student. The limitation of scholarships to specific fields

of preparation is further an abridgement of the students' freedom of choice of a career. Quite commonly, furthermore, the recipient must agree to a certain period of service in the occupation within the state that grants the scholarship. Thus in Virginia the capable high school graduate who is willing to say that he wants to prepare for public school teaching can get a scholarship, but if he wants to prepare for some other field of activity he may not qualify for a scholarship. One who accepts such a scholarship entails his future by serious restricting commitments. He must attend a college in Virginia that is state-controlled. He must serve a period in a particular kind of job, teaching, and in a particular location, the State of Virginia. In order to discharge the obligation he assumes in accepting the scholarship, he must become a bond-servant to the public school system of Virginia, unless he has the financial sources to repay to the State the amount of the scholarship funds received. In the long run, this may not be the best way of getting dedicated and properly motivated personnel into the teaching profession. The plan may quite probably have the effect of keeping teachers' salaries lower than they should be, for the state scholarships create a sort of slave market from which the public schools can annually recruit a new crop of teachers.

In other words, the considerations brought forth in this Report do

not lead to the suggestion that the General Assembly of Virginia should increase scholarship funds in general, except as a temporary means of relieving critical shortages in certain fields of service that are important to the Commonwealth. Perhaps, in the present shortage of registered nurses, scholarships for those who would like to prepare for this important field of service would be appropriate. But in general, the State's policy should be to channel all available funds directly to the support of the state-controlled institutions of higher education, in order that these institutions may keep their tuition fees at the lowest possible level.

Scholarships are a peculiarly fitting provision by the Federal government, for the objections, enumerated above for state scholarships, do not usually apply to those from Federal funds. Students enjoying Federal scholarships can freely cross state lines in choosing the institution they will attend, and usually there is no entailment of their field of future occupation or the location of service. The so-called "G. I. Bill", which extended educational benefits to veterans of military service following World War II, has been the largest and most successful example of Federal scholarship provisions. If the experience with the scholarship provisions of the Higher Education Act recently enacted by the 89th Congress is equally successful, leaders in Virginia can join those in other states in seeking an enlargement of the provisions.

Such efforts will be of more benefit to the young citizens of Virginia than the diversion of the limited resources of the State's tax money into schemes for state scholarships.

Funds for Student Housing Facilities

One final situation in the financing of higher education in Virginia should be mentioned. For a great many years, the state policy in Virginia did not allow institutions to issue revenue bonds for construction of self-liquidating projects. Thus, while for the past fifteen years Federal funds have been available at low rates of interest, with long maturities, for the financing of construction of student housing facilities, Virginia has been appropriating state tax money for building such facilities. As a result, the funds which might have been used for extending the plant facilities for instruction and research in the colleges and universities have been diverted to the financing of dormitories. Furthermore, the dormitories that have been constructed with the limited funds available have by no means kept pace with the rapid increase in applications of students for admission.

It has only been in the past biennium that this situation has been changed. The authorities of Virginia should be commended highly for having made it possible for the institutions to finance dormitories and other self-liquidating projects by means of bond issues. Under the new arrangement, the faith and credit of the State are not pledged, and the

security of the bond issue is the pledge of the revenues from the operation of the facilities. It will take many years for the state-controlled institutions of Virginia to catch up with the facilities that have been developed in other states that have not had scruples against borrowing for self-liquidating plant projects. It is interesting to note that, though millions of dollars of Federal loans have been used for college dormitory financing since the Housing Act of 1950 was passed, there has not been a single default in the payment of interest or principal by any college or university in the country which financed its dormitories on this basis.

Borrowing for new building construction is wisely limited to self-liquidating projects. Many states have in recent years developed a policy of building academic buildings, such as classrooms and libraries, on the basis of bonds which are financed by an agreement to charge a building fee to students. In this plan, the cost of providing new buildings for instructional purposes is loaded on the students who are attending and who will be attending the institutions in future years. In view of the previous recommendation about tuition fees and the high cost to the student attending college, this plan does not seem a desirable one except in extreme emergencies. It is not recommended that Virginia authorize the building of college facilities other than dormitories and associated structures, by means of bond issues.

In summary, the pay-as-you-go policy in the construction of

student housing in the state-controlled institutions of Virginia, that has prevailed in the past, may have appealed to many as financially sound and conservative. Yet, the actual result has been to deny opportunity for higher education to a number of young Virginians that reached the age of college attendance during the past fifteen years. The gap in the educational development of these citizens and the consequent loss of productivity to the economy of the Commonwealth can probably never be made up. This is more than regrettable; it is tragic. It is fortunate indeed that the "no-borrowing" policy has been abandoned, and that young people now approaching college age in Virginia can look forward to a brighter prospect than their older brothers and sisters enjoyed.

CHAPTER IV

STATE AGENCIES HAVING SOME RESPONSIBILITIES TOUCHING HIGHER EDUCATION

The Commonwealth of Virginia has a large number of different agencies of State government which have some responsibilities that touch the institutions of higher education. Most of these agencies are similar to those in other states but a few are more or less peculiar to Virginia. These state agencies are mentioned in this Chapter so as to give some ideas about the complexity of the controls or influences over the program of higher education that are exercised at the state level in Virginia. In most cases the mention will be brief and without an attempt to describe fully the scope of the agencies' activities and without critical comment.

As in every state the General Assembly of Virginia, the chief legislative body, has much to do with shaping the destiny of each of the state-controlled institutions. The General Assembly authorizes the establishment of every institution and provides the legal basis for its government and operation. At each biennial session the legislative body acts on each institution's request for supporting funds and appropriates from tax sources and from institutional revenues the funds for current operations and capital outlays. Basic changes in all

other agencies that affect higher education can be made only by the General Assembly, which is subject only to constitutional limitations on its powers. In other words, the final authority on higher education in the Commonwealth is lodged in the General Assembly.

The Governor's Office

In Virginia, the Governor's Office occupies a somewhat more central position than similar officials in some other states. As one of only three elected state officials in Virginia, the Governor is actually the only officer with executive powers who is responsible directly to the electorate. Thus the Governor and the agencies under his immediate direction have much to do with the ultimate controls of the state-controlled institutions of higher education.

As previously noted, the Governor nominates members of the Boards of Visitors, and by custom his nominees are always approved by the General Assembly or the Senate. Institutional requests for supporting funds in the form of a biennial budget are submitted to the Division of the Budget, an agency of the Governor's Office, and ultimately the decisions about the amounts to be recommended for appropriations to each institution for the General Assembly are a responsibility of the Governor. Similarly capital outlay projects require the attention of the Governor's Office and its agencies. In practice in Virginia, the General Assembly tends to follow the Governor's recommendations rather closely in making

appropriations for the support of the state-controlled institutions of higher education.

The foregoing is not meant as an exhaustive account of all the points on which the Governor and his staff members have contacts with the institutions of higher education in general. These contacts are closer and more frequent in Virginia than in many other states.

The Division of Personnel

Virginia has a commendable system of classified personnel service that applies to state employees. The Division of Personnel is organized directly under the Governor's Office. The institutions of higher education come under the provisions of the classified service for all employees except those classified as faculty members and a few specifically exempted administrative officers. Even for faculty members, the Division of Personnel must approve the salary scale followed by each institution. The Division of Personnel is responsible for seeing that the average salary in each institution conforms to the average of comparable institutions throughout the United States, in accordance with the general state policy, as has previously been mentioned in this Report.

The Division of Personnel is in capable hands and there is a general attitude of commendable flexibility in dealing with special problems of personnel in the institutions of higher education. It is only natural that there are a few points of friction at the line of juncture between the

positions that are in the classified service and those that come under the category of "faculty," the latter being exempt from the general provisions of the classified service. For example, a member of the staff to be classified as "faculty" must devote at least half time to the teaching of classes. Some of the "teaching" in an institution of higher education is not done in classes, but by librarians and counselors and in other non-classroom situations, and in the usual academic practice these people are considered "faculty." Some adjustments in the classified service have been made in the definition of "faculty" and other adjustments may be warranted particularly in the area of librarianship.

Even in the case of positions that may seem to belong in the classified service, the qualifications necessary to serve effectively in an institution of higher education may be somewhat different from those in other areas of the State government. For example, the secretary to the dean of a college may need to have qualifications considerably different from those of a secretary to the warden of a penitentiary. Furthermore it is rather awkward to have two classes of employees in a closely knit community such as college or university, for the two classes will have different privileges and benefits in such areas as vacation time, hours of weekly service, retirement provisions, and the like.

In at least one state, Illinois, the situation has been solved by

maintaining two state systems of classified service, one for the state's colleges and universities and another for all other state agencies. As long as the system in Virginia is administered as competently and as flexibly as it has been in the immediate past, it seems that minor difficulties in applying the classified service rules and regulations to the institutions of higher education can be worked out satisfactorily without any basic change in the Virginia system.

Virginia College Building Authority

The State has set up a special agency to handle the financing or borrowings for student housing by the institutions of higher education. This agency is designated as the Virginia College Building Authority. It has been in operation too short a time for any judgment about its effectiveness. Similar agencies in other states have, in general, been successful as long as they did not attempt to exercise controls over the details of planning and construction of the various college buildings. If properly handled, the College Building Authority should be able to obtain funds needed by the Virginia institutions at favorable interest rates. This would ultimately be an advantage to the students who will attend the college and live in dormitories, for the charges they must pay for accommodations must be sufficient to meet the annual obligations for interest and repayment of principal.

Virginia Commission on Higher Educational Facilities

In order to qualify for Federal grants and loans for construction of college and university facilities under a relatively recent act of Congress, each state has to designate an agency which will screen applications for such funds and make recommendations to the Federal agency for the distribution to institutions of the sums annually made available to the state. In Virginia a new state agency, the Virginia Commission on Higher Educational Facilities, has been set up to care for this responsibility. Inasmuch as the Federal funds are available alike to publicly and privately controlled institutions it has seemed desirable in Virginia to assign this responsibility to an agency other than one whose sole concern is with the state-controlled institutions. The institutions under state control in Virginia must make their application and prove their need for the facilities to the Virginia Commission on Higher Educational Facilities in order to receive Federal grants and loans for construction of new buildings within the purposes of the Act.

It is likely that in the future other new State agencies, similar to the Virginia Commission on Higher Educational Facilities, will be required to care for situations arising from the development of new kinds of Federal grants for various purposes in higher education. It might be well, in order to avoid duplication of services and facilities, for the

General Assembly in setting up each such agency to stipulate that the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia shall serve as its secretariat. The State Council has the competence in its professional staff to serve in this capacity, and the Council could also serve as a sort of coordinating influence among the separate Federal programs administered by the various agencies.

Virginia Advisory Council on Educational Television

Virginia does not at present have a state-wide system of educational television. Instead a few regional centers have been developed and are operated independently of each other. They are loosely coordinated through the Virginia Advisory Council on Educational Television. At present this agency has little impact on the institutions of higher education, for the educational television programs that have been developed through the regional centers have been aimed almost exclusively at the elementary and secondary population and at adult education on a non-collegiate level. Some of the institutions of higher education, notably those concerned with teacher education, have made use of closed circuit television in order to familiarize students preparing to teach with the use of this new medium of communication.

It is most certainly to be expected that in the future there will be a state-wide system of educational television stations in Virginia, such as other states have already developed. In a state-wide system the institutions

of higher education may be expected to participate actively. In some states that are developing along this line more rapidly than Virginia, the plans call for educational television broadcasts covering about 50 per cent of the sch ol curriculum from the elementary grades through the first two years of college. With developments such as this prospect, it is likely that institutions of higher education in Virginia will have increasing contacts with the Virginia Advisory Council on Educational Television.

Virginia Board of Technical Education

The General Assembly in 1964 established the Board of Technical Education and gave it the responsibility of setting up a system of two-year institutions, which are coming to be known as "technical colleges" throughout the State. These are a new type of institution for Virginia, a development that has been long needed in the State. The only previous example of such an institution is the rather recently established Roanoke Technical Institute, operated as a branch of Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The Board of Technical Education has gone about its task diligently, and at least one institution was opened under its general direction in the fall of 1965. Others are expected to be ready shortly. At present the plans for operating the technical colleges envision a rather highly centralized control directly under the Board of Technical Education and its staff at the state level.

Suggestions are made in Staff Report #4 of the Higher Education Study Commission for a broadening of the Board of Technical Education, and a change of its name, so that it may become the State's agency for developing and coordinating all public education in the two-year colleges in Virginia. The recommendation lays particular emphasis on the development of comprehensive two-year community colleges throughout the State, instead of the separate technical institutes or branch colleges as at present. Recommendations were also set forth in Staff Report #4 for the manner in which programs conducted under this Board should be coordinated with the rest of the State's program of higher education through the State Council of Higher Education.

Arts Commission

Virginia has a state agency which is responsible for the aesthetic appearance of the state-controlled institutions, known as the Arts Commission. Plans for each new building for any state agency or for the remodeling of an existing building must be approved by the Arts Commission, which attempts to insure architectural harmony and grace as a college or university develops its plant facilities. The Arts Commission also has to approve acquisitions of paintings, statuary, or other works of art in the state-controlled institutions, whether received by gift or purchase.

The diligence of the Arts Commission will doubtless save Virginia from developing many of the architectural botches that are now too frequently found on many college and university campuses throughout the United States. The chief complaint against the operations of the Commission arises from the delay that is often imposed upon the initiation of building construction while the members of the Commission study and analyze the plans prepared by the architects.

State Board of Education

Like every other state, Virginia lodges authority over its public school system in a State Board of Education. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is the chief executive officer of this Board, and a staff of competent specialists is employed for carrying out the necessary supervisory duties over the public schools. There are two major areas in which the State Board of Education and its professional staff have dealings with institutions of higher education.

The first of these areas is in the preparation of teachers, which is an important function in most of the state colleges and universities. It is the responsibility of the State Board of Education to supervise the granting of certificates to persons who are qualified to teach in the public schools. This involves either the prescription of minimum essentials in the curriculum for the preparation of teachers or the delegation of that responsibility to institutions which are determined to be competent to set

up such curriculums. At present the relations between the State Board of Education and the colleges and universities in Virginia seem to be harmonious and cooperative in the area of teacher education.

In one respect the teacher education forces in the State are dissatisfied with many of the institutions that prepare teachers. This dissatisfaction arises because of the policy of these institutions with respect to limitation of attendance to students of a single sex. The colleges in the State that were formerly teachers colleges admit only women students, with a few exceptions in certain cases for local residents. The State thus affords very limited opportunities for young men to prepare as elementary school teachers. This deficiency has been the subject of many complaints by leading school men of the State.

Continued maintainance of institutions of higher education that are limited to a single sex is an anachronism peculiar to the State of Virginia. In practically all the other states the single sex institutions that were formerly maintained have become coeducational, although in some states one separate college for women has been retained. In the interest of providing the best possible service in the preparation of teachers in Virginia, the institutions that offer curriculums for this purpose might well be reorganized on a coeducational basis.

The second area in which the State Board of Education and its professional staff deal in a matter affecting higher education is in the

approval of the kinds of degrees granted by each of the colleges and universities of the State. By statute, the State Board of Education is given authority to approve degrees and institutions are enjoined from offering degrees that have not been approved by the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education has not been provided with staff or appropriations that would enable the employment of a professional staff that would carry out this responsibility, so it has generally fallen as an added duty to the staff member serving as Director of Teacher Education.

The approval of the State Board of Education for the granting of degrees is required alike for state-controlled and privately controlled institutions in Virginia. In Staff Report #2 of the Higher Education Study Commission attention was called to the fact that there is some confusion about the exact powers of the State Board of Education and the application of those powers to institutions that were established by statute prior to the granting of this responsibility to the State Board of Education. This is a matter that should be clarified. Certainly some agency in the State needs to have full power and authority over programs of all institutions in the State to prevent the development of the "diploma-mill" type of operation.

Some question has also been raised as to whether the State Council of Higher Education might not be a more appropriate agency for approval

of degrees offered by institutions in Virginia. It is pointed out that, in the exercise of its functions of coordination, the State Council of Higher Education is required to pass upon each new program that is proposed by a state-controlled college or university. It may seem something of a duplication to have a program for a degree that has been approved by the State Council of Higher Education pass again under the scrutiny of the staff of the State Department of Education. The State Council of Higher Education, however, has coordinating responsibilities over only the state-controlled institutions of higher education in Virginia and it does not have similar relationships to the institutions under private control. This would argue that the present approval of programs should not be disturbed.

It should be pointed out also that the scrutiny given to a new degree program by the State Council of Higher Education is concerned with such problems as the avoidance of objectionable duplications with other institutions, the availability of supporting resources, and the needs of the State for the program. Presumably the responsibility of the State Board of Education in the approval of the degree is intended chiefly as a safeguard of the quality of the degrees that are granted. While this is also a concern of the State Council of Higher Education, it does not hurt to have two independent agencies exercising this sort of judgment.

It does not seem desirable at the present to make any recommendation

for transfer of the power now given the State Board of Education for the approval of degrees in institutions of higher education. In order to carry out this responsibility properly, however, particularly with reference to the protection of the State's citizens against institutions of the type commonly known as "diploma-mills," as was suggested in Staff Report #2, the State Department of Education should be provided with funds for the maintainance of a suitable staff to carry out this function.

The State Education Assistance Authority

An Act of the General Assembly in 1960 created an agency known as the State Education Assistance Authority, for the purpose of providing financial assistance to students attending state-controlled institutions. The Authority is "... empowered to buy and sell obligations of students at State-supported institutions of higher education representing loans made to such students for the purpose of obtaining an education." The Authority is governed by a Board of Directors, consisting of seven members appointed by the Governor for four-year terms. In effect, the operation of the State Education Assistance Authority provides an underwriting of a guarantee up to 80 per cent for loans which banks and other lending agencies may make to students. The operations of the Authority do not affect directly the state-controlled institutions, except as the guaranteed loans may make it possible for students to attend who would not otherwise be able to finance their college education.

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

Reference has already been made to the State Council of Higher Education as one of the state agencies that deals with higher education in Virginia. In fact, higher education is the sole area in which the State Council of Higher Education operates. The responsibilities and problems associated with this agency are sufficiently extensive to warrant a separate Chapter in this Staff Report. Chapter V which follows is devoted to the subject of the State Council of Higher Education.

CHAPTER V

THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA

Decades ago, when higher education was a rather simple function, carried on in only one or two or three institutions in each state, problems of coordinating the various institutional programs hardly existed. During the second and third quarters of the twentieth century there was growth and development of higher education in almost every state. Existing institutions increased rapidly in enrollment and there was corresponding expansion and extension of curriculums into more academic and professional fields and into the higher levels of graduate and advanced professional studies. New institutions were developed in some states.

The complexities arising from these expansions soon began to introduce problems of over-lapping and duplication, and state after state began to introduce plans for coordinating the programs of its institutions of higher education. In the years prior to World War II the pattern generally followed to achieve coordination was to place all the institutions of higher education in a state under a single board for operating controls. This board, naturally, would then serve as the coordinating agency for the programs of the institutions. In many

states, however, it was clear that the wide ranging problems of institutional operation would require a great deal of attention by the board, particularly if more than three or four colleges or universities were maintained. Almost all the states that have introduced coordinating patterns since 1940 have retained the individual boards for the operating controls of each state college or university, and have set up a board with functions limited to coordination at the state-wide level.

Virginia is one of the states that in the period since World War II has set up a single board for higher education with powers limited to coordination. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia was established by statute in 1956. This step was in line with the progress in many other states, and leaders in Virginia should be commended for having adopted it. Quite wisely, too, the State did not eliminate the Boards of Visitors for the individual institutions, but continued them with the same powers as previously over the operations of the institutions.

The State Council of Higher Education employs a staff of professionally qualified personnel in the field of higher education and carries on its functions in cooperation with the state-controlled institutions. The functions and powers of the State Council of Higher Education are set forth in the statute which created it, Code of Virginia, Chapter 1.1, Title 23-9.3 to 9.14.

The purpose of the State Council of Higher Education as set forth

in the statute is ". . . to promote the development and operation of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education in the State of Virginia." The purpose is to be attained through ". . . the exercise of the powers and performance of the duties set forth in this chapter." The membership of the Council consists of eight persons appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, plus the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, ex officio. Appointed members of the Council serve four-year terms, two memberships expiring each year. After having served for two successive terms, a member may not be reappointed for two years.

The statute further provides:

> The Council shall be composed of persons selected from the State at large without regard to political affiliation but with due consideration of geographical representation. Appointees shall be selected for their ability and all appointments shall be of such nature as to aid the work of the Council and to inspire the highest degree of cooperation and confidence. No officer, employee, trustee or member of the governing board of any institution of higher education, no employee of the Commonwealth or member of the General Assembly or member of the State Board of Education shall be eligible for appointment to the Council except as hereinafter specified. All members of the Council shall be deemed members at large charged with the responsibility of serving the best interests of the whole State. No member shall act as the representative of any particular region or of any particular institution of higher education.

All these provisions concerning the membership of the Council are excellent. The Council has had the benefit of service by members who

are outstanding citizens of Virginia.

The statute prescribes that the Council of Higher Education ". . . shall constitute a coordinating council" for the specifically named institutions of higher education in Virginia and ". . . such other State-supported institutions of higher education as may in the future be established." The Council is charged with the duty of examining data and, with the aid of the Boards of Visitors of the several institutions, preparing plans under which the several institutions shall constitute a coordinated system. The plans shall indicate the responsibility of the individual institutions for developing programs in specified fields of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. The Council is also required to visit and study the operations of each institution at least once during each biennium.

The Council is further required to study questions affecting statewide policies in higher education and to make recommendations with respect to such questions. But the Council is required first by the statute to "seek the views and advice of the governing boards and officers of each institution in arriving at these policies." The Council is given responsibility for determining the probable number of students who will seek a college education, and based thereon, to determine locations for branch institutions or extensions, to choose the existing state institutions which are best suited to operate such branches or extensions, and

to ascertain the cost to the State of each such branch or extension or institution.

The Council is further charged with the responsibility of making additional studies in the field of higher education as the Governor and/or General Assembly may require. It is empowered to limit any institution to such curriculum offerings as conform to the plans adopted by the Council, but this power is to be exercised only with the prior approval of the Governor. The Council is specifically prohibited from exercising any authority over the endowment funds of any institution.

The foregoing summary of the statute indicates that it is relatively comprehensive. At the same time, some of the references are a bit vague. For example, in Section 23 - 9.10, which is concerned with "determinations and reports as to branch institutions and extension work," the reference to "extension work" is not entirely clear. Does this mean that the Council should approve every new location in the State where even a single extension class is to be taught? Or did the General Assembly mean to give the Council this authority only over the formally organized branches of institutions for extension services? In practice, the State Council has not interpreted its authority as including responsibility for extension courses or the development of extension centers until such organizations were ready for formal recognition as branches of the parent institution. The statute could be interpreted, however, as intending to bring the Council into

this sort of development at an earlier stage.

Similarly, the provision in Section 23 - 9. 8 instructs the Council to ". . . cooperate with the State Board of Education in matters of interest to both the public school and the State-supported institutions of higher education, particularly in connection with coordination of the college admission requirements and teacher training programs with the public school program." The exact meaning of this provision is not well understood, and the State Council has done practically nothing in the field of requirements for admission to the colleges and universities or with respect to their teacher education programs. The Council has, however, assisted the institutions in developing some uniformity about processing of applications and acceptances of students for admission.

It may also be pointed out that Section 23 - 9. 6b requires that the State Council "shall visit and study the operations of each such institution at least once during each biennium, and shall make, or cause to be made, such other visits and studies as it shall deem necessary." There are now 24 state-controlled institutions of higher education in Virginia, including the two-year branches, and the burden on Council members of visiting as a group each of these institutions at least once every two years is considerable. Perhaps a specific reference to the frequency of visits to institutions is not wise in the statute. It would seem possible for the Council to delegate much of its responsibility for visiting institutions to the competent members of its staff.

A question may also be raised about the requirement in Section 23 - 9. 6 that the State Council must get the Governor's consent prior to taking action ". . . to limit any institution to such curriculum offerings as conform to the plans adopted by the Council." It does not seem necessary to give the responsibilities to the Governor to make a final ruling as to whether each institution might be allowed to make any proposed extension of its program, inasmuch as some of these are of relatively minor significance.

Section 23 - 9. 13 of the statute reads: "In making the studies herein directed and in the performance of its duties hereunder the Council shall, insofar as possible, seek the cooperation and utilize the facilities of existing State departments, institutions, and agencies." The extent of cooperation between the State Council of Higher Education and other agencies of State government in Virginia seems to vary considerably from one agency to another. With some, the cooperation seems close and effective, but this cannot be said of all. The State Council enjoys good support and close relations with the Governor's Office, so far as observations made in the course of this Study could determine. Good relations have also been maintained with the State Division of Personnel, where matters such a faculty salary scales have been the subject of discussion. Cooperation with the State Department of Education is more or less assured by the presence of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex officio member of the State Council of Higher Education.

Perhaps the most significant feature of the statutory grant of authority to the State Council is in Section 23 - 9. 9, which originally gave the Council duties of reviewing the biennial budget requests of the institutions in the following terms:

> Not less than thirty days prior to submitting its biennial budget request to the Governor, the governing board of each institution of higher education supported by the State shall transmit to the Council a duplicate original of its budget request for maintenance and operation and for capital outlay. In the light of these requests, and in the light of the needs of the State for higher education, the Council shall prepare an estimate of such needs for each year of the ensuing biennium, coordinating the budget requests for all the institutions but identifying the request of, and the proposed budget for, each institution, and submit the same within the time prescribed by 2-48 of the Code of Virginia to the Governor.

This provision would seem absolutely essential to the effective efforts toward the coordination of institutional programs of higher education in a state. The provisions of Section 23 - 9. 9, however, have been nullified each biennium since 1960 by a rider attached by the General Assembly to the appropriation act, providing that none of the funds appropriated for the support of the State Council of Higher Education may be used ". . . for the coordination of institution budgets as set forth in Section 23 - 9. 9 of the Code of Virginia." The origins of this rider have not been determined, but the result has been to hamstring the coordinating functions of the State Council of Higher Education, and create an almost incredible situation.

As a result of its loss of responsibility for reviewing institutional budgets, the State Council of Higher Education has also lost much of its control over program expansions and extensions in the institutions. In some cases, a program expansion has been planned and fully financed by an institution before being presented to the State Council for formal approval. In such a case the State Council seems to be without power to block a new program that may seem unwise or duplicative of the efforts of some other college or university.

It is hardly conceivable that the need for some kind of effective coordination at the state level over Virginia's 24 state-controlled institutions of higher education could be denied. There must be coordination at the state level by some agency or the entire program may be chaotic and wasteful. In the last analysis there is a sort of coordination made of the budgets of the several institutions, but it is doubtful if the Division of the Budget and particularly the General Assembly, the agencies responsible for the budget preparation and the appropriation act, have either the time or the professional competence to coordinate institutional programs and support effectively.

The State Council of Higher Education was originally conceived as the agency for coordination, and it is exactly the kind of an agency used by the great majority of states that have revised their patterns of

state higher education in the past two decades.

Currently in Virginia, it is no secret that there has been criticism of the State Council of Higher Education. In the normal course of events, steps taken in the interest of coordination will be resented by one institution while approved by most of the others. Thus, it is not uncommon in states with coordinating agencies such as Virginia has, to find that at any one time, one or more of the state's colleges or universities are very much at outs with the actions of the coordinating agency. Probably if this were not true the coordinating agency would not be doing its full duty.

But the condition in Virginia seems to go somewhat deeper than the normal display of peevishness displayed by an institution when one of its projects for expansion is disapproved (a peevishness which normally disappears rather quickly after the institution begins to realize that the expansion was unwise anyhow). A fairly extensive inquiry by the staff of the Higher Education Study Commission leads to the conclusion that certain conditions, which may not be properly understood or difficult to correct, probably contribute to some unhappiness in relations between the State Council of Higher Education and the institutions over which it bears coordinating responsibilities.

The first situation that may be mentioned seems to arise from a feeling that the State Council has not given appropriate emphasis to the

statement of its basic purposes, as set forth in Section 23 - 9. 3 of the statute. As noted previously, the statute begins with the following sentence: "The purpose of the Council shall be, through the exercise of the powers and performance of the duties set forth in this chapter, to promote the development and the operation of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education in the State of Virginia." This statement contains many words that carry unequivocally positive connotations: "promote," "sound," "vigorous," "progressive." The impression one gains from conversation with leaders of some institutions, however, is that they feel the Council has conceived its role as mainly that of restricting developments that might be unwise, rather than that of promoting progressive developments in the institutions of higher education. These two points of view are as far apart as the poles.

No attempt is made in this Report to document extensively the instances of this feeling among the institutions about the policies of the State Council of Higher Education. The actual conception the State Council holds of its role seems to be different from that which certain institutions have gathered, but the fact that they have gathered it is the important consideration. One bit of recent evidence on the point may be cited.

Shortly after the present Study of Higher Education in Virginia was undertaken under the auspices of the Higher Education Study

Commission, the State Council declared a moratorium on the approval of all requests for new programs in the Virginia institutions. This was done because it was believed that recommendations would be presented in the Report of the Higher Education Study Commission on institutional degree programs. This moratorium turned out to be a sore point with some of the colleges and universities. Even though a provision was included for the consideration of an appeal concerning a situation "which critically impairs the educational function of an institution," some felt they were delayed by several months from instituting changes they considered important.

Hindsight is usually better than foresight and at this late stage in the development of the Study of Higher Education in Virginia, it would seem to have been a better plan for the State Council to proceed with normal operations of approving new programs as they were presented and justified, without waiting for the final recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission. Actually, the moratorium was lifted in the late summer of 1965, when it became evident that the recommendations of the Study would probably not deal extensively with institutional degree programs.

A review of the actions taken by the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia since its inception indicates that a total of 94 requests for approval of new programs have been filed by the institutions. Of these,

88, or 93 per cent, have received approval by the State Council. These figures scarcely support the idea that the State Council has been entirely negative in its consideration of applications for the approval of new programs. Among the progressive improvements that the State Council has advocated and fostered and which have been achieved, are the setting up of separate Boards of Visitors for each of the former teachers colleges and the creation of Old Dominion College and Richmond Professional Institute as new colle -level institutions, each with its own Board of Visitors.

Certainly it may be necessary in some cases for the State Council to rule negatively on the application of an institution for an extension of its program. The approach to the decision, however, should be positive. That is, the State Council should start from a point of view that the proposal has been well considered by the authorities of the institution before being presented and should be approved unless there are significant indications to the contrary--or data of a state-wide nature suggests a different course of action.

There are about four questions to be asked about a proposal for the expansion of an institution's program: (1) What are the annual needs on a continuing basis in Virginia or elsewhere for the graduates who will

be produced by this new program? (2) Are there enough persons interested in enrolling in the program and qualified to enter it to populate the classes and provide a reasonably economical instructional program? (3) Are there facilities--qualified faculty members, library sources, instructional rooms and equipment, etc. --available or that can be procured to operate the program at a satisfactory level of quality? (4) What would be the increase in the annual operating budget required to support the program, and what capital outlays will its initiation entail? These questions should be answered as objectively as possible.

The primary responsibility for obtaining answers to the first three of these questions lies with the institution making the proposal, but the staff of the State Council can assist in gathering needed data and should independently evaluate the data that are compiled and presented. The staff of the State Council should be particularly concerned with the answer to the fourth question and should participate in deriving the necessary figures. There is really a fifth question, following the fourth about the cost of the program. Can the required financial support be obtained? If the answers to the first three of these questions are positive, the State Council should bend every effort to see that a positive answer is given to this question and that the required financial support is made available.

In summary of this first criticism of the State Council, the Council seems to its critics to have in the past placed too much emphasis on its role in restricting development in the State institutions of higher education, and too little emphasis has been given to the provision of assistance to

institutions in developing sound justification for their planned expansion of programs and in analyzing the needs for staff and facilities for operating such programs, and in finding the resources to support sound developments.

A second criticism of the State Council expressed at the institutional level, seems to arise from a belief that the State Council is seeking covertly to extend its authority beyond what is given it in the statute. [1] Consequently, innocent actions may be misconstrued and resented. A recent instance of this sort came in Virginia when the State Council sent out to the institutional leaders for criticism a proposed draft of a form on which necessary information would be provided for each new program submitted for approval. Strong objections arose from some institutions because the draft of this form asked questions about the department and school or college of the institution in which the new program was to be located. These institutions interpreted the question as meaning that the State Council planned to try to control the internal organization of the institution by deciding that the new program could or could not be administered in the proposed jurisdiction. The State Council had no such intent, and once this fact was communicated the matter was easily cleared up, but only after ruffled feelings were soothed.

Enough has been said to indicate that the State Council of Higher Education is presently at a critical stage in Virginia. It has had warm

---

[1] Examples cited suggest misunderstandings growing out of a lack of clear communication.

friends and supporters, but there have been some with different attitudes. During the past year, the State Council of Higher Education has worked out a well considered statement of its policies and procedures, to guide its own actions and those of the staff. The development of such a statement and the publicizing of it among the institutions should be effective in reassuring them about the manner in which the Council intends to carry out its statutory authority.

In the opinion of the Director of the Study for the Higher Education Study Commission, it is imperative that Virginia retain a sound plan for state-wide coordination in higher education. The present statute is basically sound. Some improvements could be suggested, but they are relatively minor and chiefly editorial in character. Rather than an overhaul of the statute, what seems to be needed is for everyone concerned to have a full realization of the basic purposes of the State Council as set forth in the present statute. The emphasis should be on the words: "promote the development and the operation of a sound, vigorous, progressive system of higher education in the State of Virginia;" that it shall also be a "coordinated system" is of importance too, but a system is not worth coordinating unless it is "sound, vigorous, and progressive." The Council should make it clear to the institutions that it intends to help them in their efforts to improve and extend their programs where this is justified.

One of the important functions of the State Council of Higher Education

and its staff is the furnishing of information about the operations of the institutions, not only to the state officials and other interested persons concerned with budgets and appropriations, but particularly for the benefit of the institutions themselves. Conditions that might be criticized in an institution are often reflected by statistical studies on finance, instructional programs, space utilization, etc. When data for all institutions are fed back to each of them in comparative form, with objective interpretations, the institutions themselves may be expected in many cases to take the necessary action to correct conditions that are subject to criticism. The statute clearly envisions this as an important function of the State Council of Higher Education, and much has been done along this line. Space utilization studies have been made and published, but without much interpretation. The Council has developed a uniform system for the reporting of enrollment data, and has made a beginning in the compilation of enrollments in terms of standard units, such as student-credit-hours. Considerable work has been done toward the development of uniform reports on income and expenditures and other financial data. Faculty salary data have been analyzed. The biennial reports of the State Council to the General Assembly have been informative and helpful. This is the sort of service on which the major efforts of the Council's staff can well be centered.

Many of the kinds of data collected for the present Study of Higher Education in Virginia should be compiled periodically by the staff of the

State Council of Higher Education, with the analysis and interpretation reported back to the institutions.

Chapter 144 of the Acts of the General Assembly of 1964 directs the Commission on Economy and Efficiency in Governmental Expenditures to give attention to the financial accounting and reporting and the budgetary procedures for the institutions of higher education, and refers explicitly to the recommendations of the State Council of Higher Education for a review of these matters. This is another example of a useful service to the State by the State Council of Higher Education.

In some of the other Staff Reports that have been prepared by Consultants for the Study of Higher Education in Virginia, suggestions have been made for the development of advisory committees in special fields to assist the State Council of Higher Education and its staff in making decisions. The Council has already a cost study advisory committee and an advisory committee on library problems, both of which are in a position to render important services. Suggestions made in other Staff Reports include an advisory committee on problems of extension and public services, computer services, and another for an advisory committee on problems of the two-year community colleges. There are doubtless other areas in which such advisory committees, composed chiefly of staff members at the operating level in the institutions concerned, would be helpful.

The State Council of Higher Education has in the past made considerable use of advisory committees, with members drawn from institutional personnel, for the study of special problems. This is an entirely sound procedure. The Council of State College Presidents has in the past constituted a valuable top-level advisory committee to the State Council of Higher Education on major problems. In turn, the Council of State College Presidents should share with the staff of the State Council their thinking about the desirable lines for future developments as seen from the institutional points of view.

Program coordination is a significant function of the State Council of Higher Education, as well as its most problematic area of operation. Major difficulties are encountered in determining the role and scope of each institution "with the aid of the boards and officers of the several institutions." There are obvious opportunities for conflict and difference of interpretation between the statutory responsibilities and tradition of the institutions and their governing bodies on the one hand, and the responsibilities of the Council, on the other hand. Another difficulty arises at present from the relative ease with which decisions by the State Council on programs may be circumvented or forestalled by the simple expedient of gaining budgetary support for contrary plans.

Coordinating colleges and their programs, without destroying their autonomy by creating a superboard, requires educational statesmanship and persuasive abilities of the highest order. It also requires

thorough knowledge of the entire scope of activities with which higher education is concerned; this knowledge is gained only through long experience with continuing analytical studies. The objectives of program coordination cannot be fully achieved unless the chief executive officer of the Council is a peer of the college presidents and enjoys equal status with them. Successful coordination in higher education also requires the closest sort of cooperation and communication between the State Council and the executive and fiscal authorities of the State.

The statute is completely silent with respect to the qualifications of the personnel of the State Council's staff and the rates of their compensation. The salary paid the chief executive officer of the coordinating agency needs to be on a par with that paid the presidents of the universities in the State. The Southern Regional Education Board has recently compiled data showing the salaries paid such executive officers in the Southern States. The salary in Virginia is substantially below the average for persons with similar responsibilities in the other States of the South.

The chief executive officer of the state coordinating agency must be a person whom the institutional presidents can and do respect as an equal. He must be one who can work effectively with distinguished leaders of outstanding institutions of higher education. It is understood that, when it became necessary in 1964 to chose a replacement for the chief executive officer of the State Council of Higher Education, the presidents of

the institutions were asked informally to participate in the search for a suitable person. This was a wise procedure, and should greatly assist in building confidence between the institutions and the Council.

In summary, the statutory provisions for a state-wide coordinating agency for higher education in Virginia are basically sound. The State Council of Higher Education has already demonstrated its value to the State's program of higher education. While the statute might be improved by some relatively minor changes, the most important change, legally speaking, is the removal of the rider that nullifies Section 23 - 9. 9, thus permitting the Council to exercise its statutory responsibility for reviewing the biennial budget requests of the institutions. Inasmuch as this is a rider applied to the appropriation act, its omission can easily be managed by the General Assembly.

The basic policies of the State Council of Higher Education should emphasize "promotion" and this attitude should be clearly understood by all concerned. The State Council and its staff must be careful to avoid the creation of any suspicion of efforts to intrude into matters that should be left for decision by the authorities of the individual institutions. Care must be taken by the Council in any future selection of a chief executive officer to insure continuation of the policy of choosing a person of high quality who has had suitable experience and preparation for the heavy responsibilities that must be assumed, one who can meet with presidents

of Virginia's outstanding institutions of higher education as an equal and be respected by them as such.

Continuation of the policy of maintaining a series of advisory committees is suggested for areas in which difficult problems arise, thus giving the institutional staff members at the operating level opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies and recommendations that will go to the State Council of Higher Education.

The State Council of Higher Education can and should serve as the chief advisory body to the Governor and the General Assembly in the development of state-wide policies in higher education, in formulating long-range plans to meet future needs, and in coordinating present activities in relation to future planning. The State Council can coordinate the institutions of higher education by interpreting state-wide policies and plans to the Boards of Visitors and the officers and faculty members of the institutions, and by analyzing and interpreting institutional planning and programs in the light of state-wide policies and plans.